



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,059	02/11/2002	Chen Chun Chen	DF.DEL003A	7480

7590 12/09/2002

Gazdzinski & Associates
Suite A232
3914 Murphy Canyon Road
San Diego, CA 92123

EXAMINER

GUSHI, ROSS N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,059

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Ross N. Gushi

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a structure for an AC inlet, classified in class 439, subclass 106.
- II. Claim 6, drawn to a process for fastening a wire, classified in class 29, subclass 499.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to attach a wire to any number of different electrical conductors or devices.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Attorney Gazdzinski on 11/14/02 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 6 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Schantz and Seidler. The admitted prior art discloses the device as claimed in claim 1, except that the admitted prior art does not include the free end of the second strip having a notch and projecting plate for fastening the bare wire. Schantz discloses a terminal 10 including a notch and projecting plate 16 which are used to fasten bare wire 26 to the terminal. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace the hole 4331 in the second strip with a notch and projecting plate as taught in Schantz. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to better secure the wire to the terminal prior to soldering so that the wire does not inadvertently detach, as taught in Schantz (see col. 1, lines 15-50 and col. 2, lines 45-60). Schantz teaches that the tab can be located "in the terminal 10 at the location where it is desired to solder the end of the conductor" (col. 2, lines 20-25) but does not explicitly teach that the notch be made in the free end of the terminal strip. Seidler teaches terminal strip 16 including a notch and plate 36 configuration for holding conductive mass 28 where the notch and plate are located at the free end of the strip. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to locate the notch in the

Art Unit: 2833

admitted prior art at the free end of the strip as taught in Seidler. The exact location of the notch would have been a matter of design engineering choice, given that Schantz notes that the tab may be located at any location where it is desired to solder the end of the conductor.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Schantz does not identify the elevation angle of the plate. However, Schantz does teach that the tabs may be pressed down over the top of the conductor (col. 2, lines 45-46) and that pressing may not be necessary "if the offset of tab 16 is correct for reasonably snug insertion." Col. 2, lines 58-60. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to choose an appropriate angle as desired, including angles between 20-50 degrees or 30-45 degrees. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate a conductor of a desirable size, as taught in Schantz.

Per claim 5, the length of the plate in Schantz (and Seidler) is the same as that of the notch.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Regarding claim 4, the prior art does not suggest the structure as claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements, the combination including that the width of the plate be slightly less than the width of the notch.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2833

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (703) 306-4508. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at (703) 308-2319. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is (703) 308-7766

rng

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Gushi", with a stylized flourish at the end.